

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/058,737	MURAKI, TOMOYASU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sanza L McClendon	1711	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sanza L McClendon.

(3) _____.

(2) Mike Davis.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 December 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3.

Identification of prior art discussed: all prior art made of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Editorial changes to the spec. and claims will be made in the response. In addition, claim 1 will be amended to better specify that the density is for the crosslinked rubber and rubber product and not for the isobutylene copolymer as originally interpreted by examiner. Claim 3 will be amended to a "method for" versus a "method of". Mr. Davis explains that the criticality of the density can be found in tables 1 and 2 of the specification. Examiner agrees to respond to all arguments when an official response is sent to the Office. .